

## REMARKS:

### Status of claims and amendments

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. In the Office Action dated September 21, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kritzler. These rejections are respectfully traversed in light of the instant amendments.

In this amendment, independent claims 1 and 4 were amended to recite “the rotating center being an instantaneous rotating center moving on the surface of the pivoting portion when the door handle rotates between an open position and a closed position.” No new matter is added. See at least paragraph 19 and the Figures for support for these amendments.

### The §102(b) rejections: Kritzler

In the Office Action dated September 21, 2006, the Examiner indicated that “As shown in figures 2 and 3, Kritzler et al. allows the rotating center to be an instantaneous rotating center when the door handle is moved past the normal actuated position.” Kritzler also discloses that “During normal use the handle 2 is pivoted...from the normal or rest position of FIG. 1 to the actuated or open position of FIG. 2,” (column 2, line 67-column 3, line 3), and that FIG. 3 illustrates a position “beyond the normal actuated position of FIG. 2” (column 2, lines 42-43). In other words, FIG. 1 is a closed position, FIG. 2 is an open position, and FIG. 3 is a position beyond the open position.

As the Examiner has indicated that the rotating center of Kritzler is an instantaneous rotating center when the door handle is moved between the positions of FIG. 2 and FIG. 3 (the open and beyond open positions), and not between the positions of FIG. 1 and FIG. 2 (the closed and open positions), Kritzler et al. does not disclose or suggest “the rotating center being an instantaneous rotating center moving on the surface of the pivoting portion when the door handle rotates between an open position and a closed position.” Both independent claims, 1 and 4, as well as their dependents, claims 2, 3, and 5-7, are thus patentable over Kritzler et al.

### Conclusions

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Authorization is granted to charge any outstanding fees due at this time for the continued prosecution of this matter, or credit any overpayment, to Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP Deposit Account No. 50-0310 (matter no. 060945-0136).

Respectfully submitted,



Jessica C. Stahnke (Reg. No. 57,570)

for Thomas D. Kohler (Reg. No. 32,797)

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

One Market, Spear Street Tower

San Francisco, CA 94105

415.442.1603

December 21, 2006

Date